

## Academic Senate



## ACADEMIC SENATE MINUTES

**February 2, 2011** 

**Sign-in Sheet** 

**Call to Order:** Senate Chairperson Chet Cooper called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m.

## **Minutes of the Previous Meeting:**

Minutes of the December 1, 2010, meeting were approved as posted. To view the minutes, go to <a href="http://www.www.ysu.edu/acad-senate/1011/mindec10.pdf">http://www.www.ysu.edu/acad-senate/1011/mindec10.pdf</a>>.

Senate Executive Committee (SEC) / Report from the Chair: Chet Cooper, Chair of the Senate, reported: The committee met last month with Dr. Porter regarding the General Education writing repository proposal. The Senate Executive Committee endorsed the plan and it will be presented later in this meeting.

Ohio Faculty Council report: Ken Learman reported. The OFC met last month and came forward with a resolution regarding the University System of Ohio (contained in <u>Attachment 1</u>). Tod Porter moved to support the resolution, and the motion was seconded. <u>Motion passed</u>.

Report from Sharon Stringer on Assessment: Two mentors from the Higher Learning Commission were to meet with us this week, but because of the weather, they will not be able to attend. We will reschedule them for a later date. Assessment participation has increased; so has the quality of reports. Informally, the mentors suggest that we keep the momentum going. Thank you for your

own contributions to support this effort. (A summary of assessment activities is contained in
---

**Return to Senate Homepage** 

For further information, e-mail **Bob Hogue**.



## The Ohio Faculty Council

# OHIO FACULTY COUNCIL RESOLUTION IN FAVOR OF CONTINUED STATE SUPPORT FOR THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF OHIO

Whereas, Ohio's institutions of higher education contribute to the state's economy by educating and graduating students, thus increasing the stock of human capital, workforce skills and talent and incomes of its graduates;

Whereas, Ohio's institutions of higher education contribute to the state's economy by bringing in over \$1 billion annual in research dollars which also produce innovative products and services that contribute to entrepreneurship;

Whereas, Ohio's institutions of higher education provide a wide array of services and activities that contribute to communities' health, well-being and quality of life that attract new businesses;

Whereas, the University System of Ohio lays out a systematic plan for increasing graduation rates, research activities and community services for Ohio community colleges and universities, thus increasing the State's economic resources;

Be it resolved: that the Ohio Faculty Council urges Governor Kasich and both houses of the Ohio legislature to continue the record of bipartisan support for the University System of Ohio plan;

And be it further resolved: that the Ohio Faculty Council urges Governor Kasich and the Ohio legislature to continue the state's commitment to provide the level of financial support to enable the University System of Ohio to meet its goals and thus continue to be a crucial part of economic development and job growth in Ohio.

## Update on Assessment Activities 2010-11

## **Accomplishments 2010-11**

As a result of findings during the 2008 Higher Learning Commission (HLC) Accreditation visit, YSU chose to participate in the HLC's Academy of Student Learning in lieu of a focused site visit. During its third year of participation in the HLC Academy (with completion in 2012), YSU continues to make progress on two university-wide projects:

- 1. Institute assessment of general education at all levels; institute changes to address longstanding issues, such as non-compliance with the general-education program; and undertake revisions of the general-education program based on evidence.
- 2. Engage all campus constituencies in analyzing teaching and learning at YSU; actively encourage faculty, staff, and students to provide recommendations for improving education at YSU.

A progress report was prepared and sent to the HLC Assessment Academy mentors in January 2011. The progress report included descriptions of the following accomplishments for 2010-11.

Project Area	Accomplishments, 2010						
General Education	Two initiatives are underway to improve assessment of general-education outcomes: first, to create a						
	repository of student writing and rubrics to evaluate the quality of the writing; second, to revise the						
	general-education learning outcomes and the organizational structure of courses within the general-						
	education model. Creating groups of courses that cover similar content and use similar methodology will						
	make it easier to assess whether the learning objectives of general education are being achieved.						
Voluntary System of	Summaries of the key findings from the 2010 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and the CLA						
Accountability (VSA)	are being prepared by the offices of Assessment and Institutional Research and Policy Analysis.						
The Council on	Beginning in fall 2010, the CTL implemented four learning communities as part of a two-year series of						
Teaching and	programs to help faculty and staff learn effective use of technology to promote student learning. Additional						
Learning (CTL)	information about this program is available at <a href="http://ysuteach.wordpress.com/better-learning-through-technology/">http://ysuteach.wordpress.com/better-learning-through-technology/</a> .						
E-Portfolio System	One of the CTL Learning Communities (chaired by Sue Leson) is focusing on the use of electronic portfolios to enhance student learning.						
Campus-Wide	Ongoing sessions are to encourage communications across different divisions and to reduce duplication of						
Assessment	effort. The most recent session, in May 2010, focused on what role university education has in preparing						
Dialogues—	students for their lives. The session included discussion about the challenges students commonly face in						
Roundtable Sessions	acquiring the knowledge, skills, and experiences that they need.						
Systematic	<ul> <li>Reports submitted to the Assessment Council— 82 % for 2010-11.</li> </ul>						
Assessment	The Office of Assessment substantially revised forms for planning and reporting of learning data for						
Processes for Non-	academic and non-academic units. These reporting revisions have created a more inclusive and user-						
Academic Units	friendly process and have placed greater emphasis on critical assessment issues, such as use of data in						
	decision-making. Workshops during summer and fall 2010 were well attended by faculty and staff.  Additional information about assessment processes and workshops is available at						
	http://www.ysu.edu/assessment/directions.html.						
Academic Program	• Reports submitted to the Assessment Council—89% for 2010-11 to date (see Table on back of page).						
Assessment	• Over 15 faculty have volunteered to assist the Assessment Council in reviewing the 2010 reports/plans.						
	The Office of Assessment is working directly with colleges and deans to keep communication open						
	regarding departmental assessment activities and to develop college-specific action plans for quality						
	and participation improvements.						
	• College-level assessment councils have also been building support for increased participation.						

## Update on Assessment Activities 2010-11

### Academic Programs: Assessment Plan & Report Submissions as of January 19, 2011

College	BCHHS	BCOE	CLASS	FPA	STEM	WCBA	All Colleges
Plans Submitted	17	2	13	6	14	2	54
Reports Submitted	18	5	9	6	30	4	72
<b>Total Submitted</b>	35	7	22	12	44	6	126
Not Submitted	1	0	10	0	2	3	16
Total Programs	36	7	32	12	46	9	142
Percent Submitted	97%	100%	69%	100%	96%	67%	89%

## **Current and Future Steps**

#### **Evidence Inventory**

On **February 3 and 4,** 2011, two mentors from the HLC Academy will visit campus, in a process called an Assessment Evidence Inventory, where information on assessment practice is gathered from academic and non-academic units, and then summarized to provide feedback to YSU's Academy Team. This visit will be a critical part of ensuring our success in the HLC Academy by helping YSU identify areas of strength and remaining challenges. In preparation for this visit, the following initiatives will continue during spring 2011:

### **General Education**

This summer, writing samples from an English composition course will be evaluated; this is the first step in a program to collect information on YSU students' ability to communicate in writing. The General-Education Committee is focusing on revising YSU's thirteen general-education learning outcomes and the general-education domains.

#### Voluntary System of Accountability

The HLC Academy team will place a priority on reviewing, discussing, and disseminating NSSE and Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) results to the campus community.

### Council on Teaching and Learning

The CTL sponsored a very successful one-day institute on teaching with technology on January 13, 2011. Information on the keynote speaker, materials related to other presentations, photos from the day, and more are available on the Better Learning Through Technology Institute course in Blackboard.

#### Campus-Wide Assessment Dialogues-Roundtable Session

The fourth "roundtable" session of YSU Committees is planned for **January 28, 2011, in the Ohio Room**. The topic for discussion centers on the purpose of the Evidence Inventory; this will be accomplished through a presentation on the visit structure as well as the multiple dimensions considered critical to establishing and supporting a healthy assessment culture on campus.

## **Program Assessment**

The Office of Assessment, the Assessment Council, the General Education Committee, and the Council on Teaching and Learning will continue to collaborate to align activities. This alignment meets YSU's goal to reframe assessment as meaningful improvement in teaching and learning and to build a more systemic process for enhancing educational programs at YSU.

To: Members of the Academic Senate

From: Tod Porter, General Education Coordinator

Re: Proposal for Assessment of Written Communication

Date: January 27, 2011

The General Education Committee's proposal for written communication was designed to achieve two goals: encourage and document writing within the major and, for the purposes of General Education assessment, gather writing samples.

The discussion at the meeting made it clear that the Senate did not view the policy as an appropriate way to achieve the first goal. It was suggested that a return to a system of writing intensive courses or a writing across the curriculum program would be more effective. Faculty strongly expressed concern about the minimum required length of the writing samples not matching common practice within certain disciplines. We respect that decision. At some point in the future (probably next year) the committee will have an extended discussion about written communication instruction beyond the composition courses.

The need to make progress on assessment in the area of General Education, however, is pressing. The Higher Learning Commission cited assessment of General Education as a weakness when it conditionally renewed the University's accreditation. Failure to show progress could result in the University being placed on probation, which would be very detrimental to the reputation of the institution and could hamper our ability to recruit well-qualified students. The committee continues to believe that the repository is a cost-efficient means of addressing the assessment issue, and does so in a way that minimizes the burden imposed on the faculty. Therefore, the committee has revised the proposal so that only one writing sample related to the major is required. The minimum length of the writing sample has been reduced to 750 words (approximately 3 pages). This is the minimum length the committee feels is needed to adequately assess student writing. As before, the paper can come from any course related to the major (including the capstone). Departments that choose to ask students to upload additional documents for program assessment would be free to do so.

One other concern expressed in the senate is whether it will be possible to fairly evaluate papers coming from a variety of different disciplines. The following steps will be taken to address those concerns:

- A "best practice" technique to evaluate writing is the use of "anchor papers." An anchor paper is chosen to serve as an example of certain level of quality. In their training reviewers would be asked to read anchor papers so they have similar expectations and score the papers more consistently. Colleges will be asked to submit anchor papers which would then be used in the reviewer training. The reviewers would then have a point of reference as to what is considered a well-written paper for a given discipline.
- A new rubric will be developed by a committee. The committee will include representatives from all colleges to insure that the language of the rubric is appropriate for use across all disciplines.
- Faculty (part-time or full-time) from any department are welcome to be involved in reviewing the writing samples. The one requirement is that reviewers will be expected to undergo training in how to evaluate the papers.
- After a writing sample has been scored by the reviewers the faculty for the student's program will have the option of scoring the document using the same rubric. Comparisons of the scores by the reviewers and the program faculty will be used to monitor whether the scores of the two groups are consistent.

Our hope is that by only requiring one writing sample departments can find a way to incorporate the requirement into their curriculum with a minimal amount of inconvenience and still help to address the very real need to show progress in the area of General Education assessment.

#### **Assessment of Written Communication for General Education**

To assess students' abilities to communicate in writing, students will be required to upload writing samples to the Repository of Assessment Documents. Prior to graduation, students seeking a baccalaureate degree will be required to upload two samples of their writing.

One document will be from an assignment given in the second English composition course (ENGL 1551). The assignment will be selected by the Composition Program Director. A second document will be a writing sample related to the student's major. Departments or programs will determine the assignment that the student will upload. By the start of each fall semester, starting in 2011, departments or programs must have determined which assignment will be uploaded. Additional documents may be uploaded for program assessment at the discretion of the program. The General Education Coordinator will report annually on each major's rate of compliance with the policy to the Academic Senate.

Both of the writing samples must have been written to complete a graded assignment for a course. The writing samples must be at least 750 words long and should be fewer than 4,000 words and should demonstrate the use of critical thinking. Any guidelines or assignment prompts related to the writing sample should be provided in an electronic format to the students so they can copy and paste those directions into the document being submitted (words in the guidelines or prompts do not count toward the length requirement). Students will be asked to remove any information from the writing sample that could be used to identify them or their instructor.

The rubric used to evaluate the writing samples will be developed by a committee consisting of one representative from each college, the General Education Coordinator, and two additional members appointed by the General Education Coordinator based on their expertise in written communication and critical thinking. The committee will seek comment from the faculty prior to finalizing the design of the rubric.

Only aggregated scores based on the writing samples will be reported to the campus community; scores for individual students and the students of individual faculty will not be released. The General Education Committee shall not calculate scores aggregated by the students' individual programs or departments. Programs have the option of using writing samples authored by their majors for program assessment.

The General Education Coordinator will summarize the results of the scores and submit a report to the Academic Senate annually. In the 2013-14 academic year, the General Education Committee will assess the effectiveness of the writing assessment program and submit a report to the Academic Senate.

## YSU ACADEMIC SENATE ATTENDANCE ROSTER – February 2, 2011

At Large (6) Birsen Karpak, Management Patrick Bateman, Marketing Came Ram Kasuganti, Management	BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION Departmental (2009-2011) Ying Wang, Marketing	Departmental (2010-2012)  Helen Guohong Han, Management Ray Shaffer, Acctg. & Finance		
Dave Law, Acctg & Finance  Kathleen Mumaw, Acctg & Finance  Michael Villano, Acctg & Finance	EDUCATION			
At Large (5)  Regina Rees, Teacher Ed.  Barbara O'Connor, Teacher Ed.  Hong Kim, Teacher Education	At Large continued Patrick Spearman, EFRTL Matt Paylo, Couns/Sp. Ed.	Departmental (2010-2012)  Jake Protivnak, Couns/Sp Ed  Wilma Djoleto, EFRTL  Lauren Cummins, Teacher Ed.		
At Large (6) Darla Funk, Music Hae-Jong Lee, Music Francois Fowler, Music Brian Kiser, Music Randall Goldberg, Music ARM Allan Mosher, Music	FINE & PERFORMING ARTS Departmental (2009-2011)  John Murphy, Thtr/Dance	Departmental (2010-2012)  David Gill, Art  Cary Horvath, Communication  Alice Wang, Music		
At Large (5)  Keisha Robinson, Health Prof Ken Learman, Physical Therapy Teresa Volsko, Health Professions Thelma Silver, Social Work Rachael Pohle-Krauza, Human Ecol	HEALTH & HUMAN SERVICES  Departmental (2009-2011)  Gordon Frissora, Criminal Justice Grace Heo, Social Work  Weiqing Ge, Physical Therapy  Sue Lisko, Nursing	Departmental (2010-2012) Mary Yacovone, Health Professions Dennis Latess, HPES Priscilla Gitimu, Human Ecology		
At Large (6) Molly Jameson Cox, Psychology David Porter, Political Science Tod Porter, Economics Rick Shale, English John Sarkissian, Foreign Language L.J. (Tess) Tessier, Phil/Rel.	Liberal Arts & Social Sciences (CLASS)  Departmental (2009-2011)  Julia Gergits, English  Alan Tomhave, Phil/Rel  Keith Lepak, Political Sci  Matt O'Mansky, Sociol & Anthr,	Departmental (2010-2012)  Dennis Petruska, Economics  Diana Burkhart, Foreign Language  Dawna Cerney, Geography  Anne York, History  Rocio Rosales, Psychology		
Science,	Technology, Engineering, & Mathematics			
At Large (6)  Annette M. Burden, STEM  Carol Lamb, ENTC  Hazel Marie, MECH & ISEGR  DL Darrell Wallace, MECH & ISEGR  Kin Moy, ENTC  Bob Hogue, CSIS	Jepartmental (2009-2011)  Jamal Tartir, Math Ray Beiersdorfer, Geol & Env. Sci. Abdurrahman Arslanyilmaz, CSIS Chet Cooper, Biology Brian Leskiew, Chemistry	Yogen M. Panta, MECH & ISEGR  Yogen M. Panta, MECH & ISEGR  James Andrews, PhsAstr  Phil Munro, ECEGR  Brian Vuksanovich, ENTC  Hans Tritico, CEEGR & CHEGR		
Martin Abraham Jonelle Beatrice Bege Bowers Jef Davis Jef Davis Was Bryan DePoy  A Samanda Sacco, STEM Sarah Lowry, CLASS Brionna Benson, HHS Victoria Magyar, FPA Rachael Paras, WCBA Caitlin Dorbish, Educ. Bob Scott, Grad.	ADMINISTRATORS (15)  Mary Lou DiPillo Jack Fahey Shearle Furnish Peter Kasvinsky Ikram Khawaja STUDENTS Megan Derthick, At-large Sara Black, At-large Darla Conti, At-large Evan Beil, At-large Swetha Chatla, At-large	Paul Kobulnicky James Kohut Betty Jo Licata Joseph Mosca Shannon Tirone Nicholas Meditz, SGA Stephen Mesik, SGA Alyssa DiBernardi, SGA		